

### REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are numbered 1-22. Claim 1 has been amended herein. No new material has been added.

### Rejections

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imaino (U.S. Patent No. 5,929,326), hereafter referred to as Imaino. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

In the "Response to Remarks" portion of the current Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the term "integral" is sufficiently broad to embrace constructions united by such means as fastening and welding. As such, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 to include the limitation "integrated within" instead of integral. Applicants submit that the term "integrated within" does not embrace constructions united by such means as fastening, bonding, welding, or the like.

Applicants have reviewed Imaino and respectfully assert that the claimed limitations of amended Claim 1 are not anticipated by Imaino. Particularly, Applicants have amended Independent Claim 1 to include the limitation that the head-disk interaction sensor is "integrated within said flexure." Support for this limitation can be found at least on page 10 (last sentence of paragraph 28) which states "An accelerometer 205 is fabricated as an integral part of flexure 202."

Applicants assert that Imaino fails to teach or suggest a head-disk interaction sensor that is integrated within the flexure, as claimed. Particularly, Imaino teaches in column 5, lines 2-5 "The sensor element 68, preferably comprising a piezoelectric or piezoresistive material as described above is provided adjacent and preferably bonded

to slider 63, to form the glide sensor 60.” Imaino fails to teach or suggest integrating the sensor within the flexure, as claimed. In opposition, Imanino teaches bonding to slider 63 to form the glide sensor which is very different from integrating within, as claimed.

For this rational, Claims 1-22 are not anticipated by Imaino. As such, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed and request allowance of Claims 1-22.

## CONCLUSIONS

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the amendments presented, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-22 overcome the rejection of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account No. 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Dated: 2/16/, 2007



John P. Wagner  
Registration No. 35,398

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
123 Westridge Dr.  
Watsonville, Ca 95076